

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

A.H.,

Plaintiff,

v.

WYNN LAS VEGAS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01041-GMN-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 100]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to compel responses to written discovery from Defendant Venetian Las Vegas Gaming, LLC. Docket No. 100.

"Discovery is supposed to proceed with minimal involvement of the Court." *F.D.I.C. v. Butcher*, 116 F.R.D. 196, 203 (E.D. Tenn. 1986). Counsel must strive to be cooperative, practical, and sensible, and should seek judicial intervention "only in extraordinary situations that implicate truly significant interests." *In re Convergent Techs. Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328, 331 (N.D. Cal. 1985). To that end, discovery motions may be filed only after a robust conferral process, which requires personal consultation in the form of in-person, telephonic, or video discussions. *See Cardoza v. Bloomin' Brands, Inc.*, 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1145 (D. Nev. 2015); *see also* Local Rule IA 1-3(f).

The instant motion indicates that a meet-and-confer was held on March 21, 2025, but no meaningful details are provided.¹ *See* Docket No. 100 at 3; *but see ShuffleMaster, Inc. v. Progressive Games, Inc.*, 170 F.R.D. 166, 171 (D. Nev. 1996). On April 18, 2025, Defendant served supplemental responses to Plaintiff's initial written discovery. *Id.* at 4. Plaintiff submits


¹ Plaintiff and Defendant also exchanged multiple letters. Docket No. 100 at 3-4. As the case law and the rules make clear, however, "[t]he exchange of written, electronic, or voice-mail communications does not satisfy" the meet-and-confer requirement. Local Rule 1-3(f).

1 that the “supplemental responses resolved a dispute concerning one of three challenged
2 interrogatory answers, but did not resolve the issues presented in this motion.” *Id.* It does not
3 appear that further conferral efforts were made in relation to those responses. *But see McNamara*
4 *v. Hallinan*, 2019 WL 918984, at *2 n.3 (D. Nev. Feb. 25, 2019) (further telephonic conference is
5 required when circumstances have changed regarding the issues in dispute).

6 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice. Docket No. 100.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: April 29, 2025

9
10 
11 Nancy J. Koppe
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28